

**MINUTES**  
**UTAH**  
**MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPY**  
**LICENSING BOARD**  
**MEETING**

**September 15, 2006**

**Room 402 (formerly 428) – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – 9:00 A.M.**  
**Heber Wells Building**

**CONVENED:** 9:24 A.M.

**ADJOURNED:** 2:33 P.M.

**Bureau Manager:**  
**Board Secretary:**

Noel Taxin  
Karen McCall

**Board Members Present:**

Jean N. Soderquist, PhD  
Karen Feinauer  
Richard Nielsen, PhD

**Board Members Absent:**

James M. Harper, PhD, Chairperson  
Lanae Valentine, PhD

**Guests:**

Craig Jackson, Division Director.  
Ami Frost, BYU Student  
Thorana Nelson, UAMFT  
Ami Frost, Student  
Jeff Jackson, Student  
Nathan Wood, UAMFT  
Troy Faddis, UAMFT  
Crystal Pilling, Student

**TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION**

**DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS:**

Acting Chairperson

Dr. Harper was absent from this meeting. Dr. Soderquist was requested to act as chairperson for this meeting.

Read and approve the June 2, 2006 Minutes.

Dr. Nielsen made a motion to approve the minutes with a minor revision. Ms. Feinauer seconded the motion. **The Board vote was unanimous.**



**BUSINESS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING:**

Update On the requested Rule Change                      To be discussed during the rules discussion.

**APPOINTMENTS:**

**10:00 A.M.**

Suzanne Dastrup, Probationary Interview                      Dr. Dastrup met for her probationary interview.

Dr. Nielsen conducted the interview.

**Dr. Nielsen commented that Dr. Dastrup met telephonically for her last probationary interview. Dr. Nielsen asked Dr. Dastrup to update the Board on how she perceives herself as being in compliance with her Stipulation and Order.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she thought she was in compliance and then discovered that she was out of compliance. Dr. Dastrup stated that she is doing ok. She asked if the Board received the letter from Dr. Don Price, her supervisor.

**The Board and Ms. Taxin responded that the letter from Dr. Price was received and reviewed.**

**Ms. Taxin requested Dr. Dastrup to be more specific regarding what she is doing.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she drives to Salt Lake to review cases with Dr. Price on Thursdays. She stated that she and Dr. Price have reviewed the borderline cases together.

**Ms. Taxin asked how many borderline clients Dr. Dastrup is currently working with.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she has two clients and one is going to be terminated soon. She stated that she takes the genogram instead of the complete file as that gives Dr. Price the whole picture of the client. She stated that Dr. Price has not requested to review any case notes. She explained that he has numbered each client and will request to talk about #5, etc.

**Dr. Nielsen commented that part of Dr. Dastrup's**



**problem is that the case notes have not been complete and not reviewed.**

**Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Price should be reviewing the files and the case notes to be sure Dr. Dastrup is documenting correctly and consistently.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that the Order does not require the supervisor to review the case notes.

**Ms. Taxin stated that the Order does require random review and if Dr. Price is not reviewing case notes then he is not aware of what Dr. Dastrup is doing with her clients plus her documentation.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that Dr. Price uses the numbers to select random cases he wants to review.

**Dr. Nielsen stated that Dr. Price should be reviewing the case notes and not just the genogram. Dr. Nielsen asked if the review is of the hand written notes and where Dr. Dastrup retains the complete files.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that the notes are handwritten and all files are kept in a locked file in her home.

**Ms. Taxin asked if Dr. Dastrup takes files to her second location for the appointments there.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she does take the files she will need for the appointments at the second location. She asked if the Board wants Dr. Price to review her files.

**Dr. Nielsen again responded that Dr. Price should be randomly reviewing the complete files.**

**Ms. Taxin again stated that Dr. Price should be reviewing files to be sure she has documented the effect of each case, the issues being worked on, etc.**

**Dr. Nielsen stated that Dr. Price has been a supervisor and should be aware of the requirements of supervision.**

Dr. Dastrup again responded that she did not



remember ever hearing that Dr. Price needs to review her cases.

**Ms. Taxin stated that in the last meeting with Dr. Dastrup that she and the Board stated that Dr. Price needs to be specific in the reports on issues being discussed and what they discuss in supervision. Ms. Taxin stated that the Division and the Board are trying to get a clear picture of what Dr. Dastrup is doing therapeutically with her clients and that she is a safe practitioner. She stated that the report from Dr. Price is a general report that states Dr. Dastrup is a safe practitioner but does not tell the Division or Board anything specific. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Price commented that Dr. Dastrup showed him pictures. She asked that the pictures be brought to her interview for the Board to review. Ms. Taxin requested Dr. Dastrup to explain what she is doing differently than she did before being put on probation, what she has learned regarding boundaries and her own violation of boundaries. Ms. Taxin concluded that she and the Board do not know what Dr. Dastrup is doing in her practice.**

Dr. Dastrup read the Order. She stated that she is learning and trying to do her practice correctly.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup should be sharing information in her interviews and showing her and the Board how she is being a safe and ethical practitioner.**

Dr. Dastrup commented that Dr. Price has documented on his reports that she is a safe practitioner and the Division and Board should listen to what he is saying.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Price does not make the decisions on Dr. Dastrup's probation. She stated that the Division and the Board make the probationary decisions.**

**Ms. Feinauer stated that at the last meeting Dr. Dastrup commented that she could not afford to meet with Dr. Price weekly due to financial commitments. Ms. Feinauer asked what has changed for Dr. Dastrup to now be able to meet**



**weekly.**

Dr. Dastrup commented that she went on vacation she asked someone in DOPL if she needed to have supervision and was informed that if she did any therapy then she would be required to have supervision during the vacation time. She stated that she was also informed that if she had an extended vacation she should put her license on inactive status as her probation time would stop and when she returned to Utah she should activate the license and the probation time would then start again.

**Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Dastrup should call and talk with her directly regarding the probation.**

Dr. Dastrup then asked why it made Ms. Taxin angry for her to talk to someone else.

**Ms. Taxin responded that she was not angry but was frustrated as Dr. Dastrup has been on probation for a period of time and should know the process. Ms. Taxin stated that she should be the one telling Dr. Dastrup the requirements of her probation and Dr. Dastrup should be communicating with her so she and the Board are kept informed.**

Dr. Dastrup stated that she has terminated some of her clients. She stated that she received a call from JW and made the call brief. She stated that she has had 3 clients invite her to family outings and the outing did sound like fun, but she declined as she did not think it would be appropriate.

**Dr. Nielsen stated that these are the things Dr. Dastrup should be sharing within her interviews.**

Dr. Dastrup commented that her notes are still hand written.

**Ms. Taxin stated that the case notes protect her. She stated that hand written notes are acceptable but they need to be detailed. Ms. Taxin stated that the notes would protect her and the client if a complaint was made. Ms. Taxin gave the example that if a client hugs Dr. Dastrup the incident should**



**be noted in the case notes and also it should be noted that Dr. Dastrup informed the client that a handshake is acceptable. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup's notes should be more detailed. She suggested Dr. Dastrup develop with her supervisor a list of what she should include in her case notes.**

Dr. Dastrup commented that she was not aware that the Division and Board wanted her to bring anything to the probationary interviews.

**Dr. Soderquist clarified that this is Dr. Dastrup's second face to face meeting with the Board as the last meeting was telephonic.**

**Ms. Taxin stated that she and the Board want to be sure Dr. Dastrup understands what happened and they want to make sure it does not happen again. She stated that the supervision is very important to assist in that process. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup was requested to submit a list of possible supervisors based on her comment that it was difficult to drive to Salt Lake City for her to meet with Dr. Price and the prohibitive costs of supervision. She stated that a list has not yet been submitted.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that economically it is difficult to drive to Salt Lake City for supervision and to pay for that supervision. She stated that she did not understand that it was an assignment to bring a list of potential supervisors to this meeting. Dr. Dastrup commented that she did contact 2 other people but one moved to Hawaii and the other did not respond to her. She stated that Dr. Price is frustrated as he has not heard from Ms. Taxin or the Board regarding what is required of him as a supervisor.

**Ms. Taxin reminded Dr. Dastrup that in the last meeting she committed to looking into a new supervisor as an option.**

Dr. Dastrup stated that she did not recall the conversation.

**Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Price may continue as Dr. Dastrup's supervisor. She asked Dr.**



**Dastrup to ask Dr. Price to document on the report that he reviewed a specific number of files and the notes were clear, that specific issues were discussed and this is the evaluation of the discussions and address the borderline cases reviewed.**

Dr. Dastrup then responded that she did not know her case notes were an issue.

**Dr. Nielsen responded that the case notes were a part of Dr. Dastrup's hearing as being a problem.**

**Ms. Taxin agreed that the case notes were part of Dr. Dastrup's issues as she could not review the case notes for supporting documentation. Ms. Taxin stated that the Division and Board responsibility is understand how Dr. Dastrup is learning to set different boundaries and what steps she is taking to keep those boundaries.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she and Dr. Price have talked about boundaries. She stated that she has her family picture in both of her offices and she does hug clients periodically when the situation warrants.

**Ms. Taxin asked Dr. Dastrup what might be the potential harm of a family picture in her office and of hugging clients.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that both would indicate that she has attachments and the client could bring up personal questions.

**Ms. Taxin asked if having a picture of her family could open her up for harm to herself or her family. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup might be placing herself and family at risk.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that her Dentist and Accountant have their family pictures in their offices and she did not see any risk in having her family picture in her office.

**Dr. Soderquist commented that it is not wrong to have a family picture in the office but Dr. Dastrup should be aware of issues.**



**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Price is the eyes for the Division and Board and should communicate with her if he has any questions. She stated that the Board invited Dr. Price to attend any probationary interview with Dr. Dastrup if he would like to come for clarification.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that Dr. Price wants to hear from the Board and not from her regarding expectations. She stated that she asked Dr. Price if he would like to attend with her and he declined the offer.

**Dr. Soderquist stated that there were several items discussed at the last meeting.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she did not recall any of the things discussed.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Price is always welcome to contact her regarding the supervision and he has not made that contact. She suggested Dr. Price come to the December meeting for clarification.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she would have to pay Dr. Price if he came to meet with the Board.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup was now moving into a different area. She stated that she does not always have time to contact the supervisor for each probationer and ask if they have any concerns. She stated that Dr. Dastrup has a responsibility to inform the supervisor of the discussion at the interviews.**

**Dr. Soderquist and Dr. Nielsen reminded Dr. Dastrup that she took notes during the telephonic appointment.**

**Dr. Soderquist asked Dr. Dastrup if she had any additional questions to discuss.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that Dr. Price has reported that they do not need to meet weekly and would the Board consider changing the weekly requirement.

**Dr. Soderquist responded that changing from weekly is not negotiable at this time.**



**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup could bring it up again later after she has submitted information and communicated more with the Board.**

Dr. Dastrup again stated that Dr. Price has twice suggested that they do not have to meet weekly for supervision and would the Board reconsider.

**Dr. Soderquist asked how many clients Dr. Dastrup is seeing at this time.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she is currently seeing 35 clients a week.

**Dr. Soderquist stated that supervision should be 1 hour of supervision in every 10 hours of practice and weekly supervision needs to continue for a longer period of time.**

**Ms. Taxin asked if Dr. Dastrup has talked with Dr. Price about reducing the fees for supervision. She stated that Dr. Dastrup commented that she was embarrassed to ask but maybe she should discuss the issue with Dr. Price.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that she was not embarrassed to discuss the issue but would never ask anyone to supervise for less. She stated that it is frustrating to try so hard to the probation right and then be told by Ms. Taxin and the Board that she is still doing it wrong. She stated that she is paying \$500.00 a month for doing it wrong.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Dastrup's frustration is understandable but other options have been suggested and maybe she should look into those options.**

Dr. Dastrup responded that Dr. Price has stated for 9 months that she is not a hazard to the public and his comments have not been considered.

**Dr. Soderquist stated that Dr. Dastrup is financially losing time in travel and she can choose a different supervisor if she wants.**



Dr. Dastrup asked if she can now make that decision.

**Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Dastrup could make that decision but would need to submit information for her to review for a new approved supervisor.**

Again Dr. Dastrup asked if she can make some choices.

**Again Ms. Taxin responded that Dr. Dastrup could make some choices on her supervisor.**

**An appointment was made for Dr. Dastrup to meet again December 8, 2006.**

**10:20 A.M.**

Craig Ramsey, Probationary Interview

Mr. Ramsey met for his probationary interview.

Mr. Ramsey submitted his current report.

**Ms. Taxin conducted the interview.**

**Ms. Taxin read the report. Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Ramsey if there were any concerns he would like to discuss with the Board as he meets only once a year.**

Mr. Ramsey stated that he would like to discuss termination of his probation.

**Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Ramsey to summarize what he has learned from his probation.**

Mr. Ramsey responded that he has learned that what he is now doing is easier than being in private practice. He explained that he is employed with AETNA, has a nice salary and a nice retirement plan.

**Ms. Taxin asked Mr. Ramsey if things changed and he had to go back into private practice or work for an agency what would he do differently.**

Mr. Ramsey responded that he would not do holding therapy again. He stated he would do only the mainstream therapies. He stated that, if he needed to go back to private practice or into an agency, he would be sure the supervision is consistent, that staffing is on



a regular basis and that case notes are clearly written. Mr. Ramsey stated that AETNA has regular staff meetings, ongoing training, courses through the University of Utah and seminars on substance abuse. He further stated that AETNA does clinical intakes for facilities, uses ASA criteria and does face to face evaluations.

**Dr. Soderquist asked what has helped him while he has been on probation.**

Mr. Ramsey responded that he has gone to therapy and that helped. He stated that he did not receive outside suggestions, help, etc. when doing the holding therapy and it would have been helpful to have had input. He stated that the quarterly meetings with the Board were a little difficult but the Board has been kind, encouraging and has given him helpful feedback.

**Ms. Taxin requested the Board to consider Mr. Ramsey's request for early termination of his probation.**

**Ms. Feinauer made a motion for early termination of probation based on Mr. Ramsey being consistently in compliance with his Stipulation and Order.**

**Dr. Nielsen seconded that motion.**

**Dr. Nielsen asked if the termination date would be December 4, 2006 as that is the date Mr. Ramsey's probation is scheduled to end.**

**Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Ramsey should write a formal letter requesting early termination and, upon approval of the Board, she would then prepare the paperwork prior to the December 4, 2006 date.**

**Ms. Taxin stated Mr. Ramsey could hand write the letter before he left if he would like.**

Mr. Ramsey thanked the Board and responded to Ms. Taxin that he would rather type up a formal letter.

**Ms. Feinauer revised her motion and recommended early termination of probation based**



**on Mr. Ramsey being consistently in compliance with his Stipulation and Order pending receipt of a formal letter of request.**

**Dr. Nielsen seconded the motion.**

**The Board vote was unanimous.**

**Ms. Taxin expressed appreciation to Mr. Ramsey for being responsible in completing his probation. She also expressed appreciation for Mr. Ramsey's employer being detailed in his reports.**

**10:40 A.M.**  
Rules Review

**Ms. Taxin explained that the new rules are in effect. She stated that there have been some questions about the area where the LCSW can meet the requirements of an approved MFT supervisor. Ms. Taxin stated that the Division has been asked if there is a list of approved supervisors and stated that there is no list. Ms. Taxin asked if Board members had any comments or feedback.**

**Board members responded that there was no feedback.**

Thorana Nelson asked if a supervisor-in-training is an acceptable supervisor as the AAMFT rule is the supervisor candidates must have been licensed and in clinical practice for a minimum of 2 years when they apply for supervisor-in-training. Ms. Nelson stated that a candidate may begin supervision as soon as they are licensed.

**Ms. Taxin responded that the intent is for the supervisor to document they are licensed. She stated that the AAMFT standard could be used for better clarification. Ms. Taxin stated that a list of approved supervisors is required. She stated that there are people who are applying for licensure who have a supervisor on the AAMFT approved list but the supervisor does not hold a valid MFT license. Ms. Taxin stated that she is not sure how to enforce the requirement of the supervisor being licensed, as the new MFT applicant has spent 2 years or more being supervised and then is getting consequenced for inappropriate or not receiving**



**credit for the hours they have worked for the past two years as the supervisor was not licensed but was on the AAMFT approved supervisor list. She stated that the Division does not have a list of approved supervisors and is not sure that it is feasible for the Division to develop or maintain a list.**

Thorana Nelson responded that the Utah Association has a list of approved supervisors and the AAMFT list is available to supervisors if they want to be listed. She stated that the AAMFT website has their list available. Thorana Nelson stated that AAMFT has a form for the potential supervisor to complete. She offered to mail a form to Ms. Taxin for review. Thorana Nelson stated that Division staff could also refer people to the Utah AMFT website.

**Ms. Taxin requested Thorana Nelson to provide her a form and the website address.**

Thorana Nelson stated that she would send the information.

**Ms. Taxin stated that in the new Rules, R156-60b302b(3), opens up the availability of the supervision to be under an LCSW, Psychologist and Professional Counselor. Ms. Taxin asked the Board and Ms. Nelson if other States accept this type of supervision.**

Thorana Nelson responded that most of the other States will accept only an AAMFT approved supervisor and anyone obtaining licensure with supervision from other mental health therapists is limiting licensure in the other States. She stated that California is one State that allows other mental health therapists to supervise.

**Ms. Taxin asked if there were any other concerns regarding this section of the Rules on how it reads and enforcing it.**

Thorana Nelson asked who would retain the list of other approved Mental Health Therapist supervisors as the Utah Association list would not include the others.



Thorana Nelson stated that a potential supervisor would have to submit an application and list what they have accomplished and courses completed for the Division to review and accept.

**Ms. Taxin commented that her concern is potential supervisors will take some courses and then want the Division to review and accept courses that may not meet the requirement.**

Thorana Nelson responded that there is some oversight on some courses as they are AAMFT approved courses. She stated that section R156-60b-302a(2)(a) is clear but part (b) is where the Division will have to review the coursework as it is not AAMFT accredited.

**Ms. Taxin stated that she did not draft these rules. She stated that if there is good justification for the rule to be deleted or changed then the Board can recommend it be deleted or changed. She stated that it is time consuming to review coursework and syllabi. Ms. Taxin stated that a list of courses that would meet the requirements would have to be developed to assist in the review.**

Thorana Nelson commented that the Division may have individuals who will ask why they were not accepted when another person with the same courses was accepted. Thorana Nelson stated that there were 18 people who have completed the supervision course and do not have interns to supervise.

**Ms. Taxin responded that a list of approved supervisors would be helpful to the Division staff.**

Thorana Nelson stated that the Division has the AAMFT approved supervisor list available on their website, she retains the Utah AMFT list on the Association website. She stated that the Division would have the new applications from other Mental Health Therapist to review and approve as supervisors.

Thorana Nelson stated that the Utah AMFT supervisor will have a formal letter stating they have completed the supervisor program and are approved to supervise that they can submit to the Division.



**Ms. Taxin commented that the Division currently has an application where the supervisor stated she was AAMFT approved but was not on their list. She stated that, upon further investigation, the supervisor started the AAMFT process but did not complete the process. Ms. Taxin stated that the MFT Intern cannot be licensed without proper supervision.**

Thorana Nelson suggested pre-approving the supervisor before the MFT Intern license is issued. Ms. Nelson stated that Utah AMFT could maintain the information on their website with a link from the Division.

**Ms. Feinauer commented that it appears that the rural areas are having difficulty obtaining supervision.**

Thorana Nelson responded that supervisors are all over Utah but are limited in the rural areas. Thorana Nelson asked if the Board would like to discuss the phone therapy issue.

**Ms. Taxin responded that the phone therapy is an issue that needs to be discussed but at a later time.**

**Dr. Soderquist commented that the Division personnel should notify people that if their supervisor is not AAMFT approved they may not be able to obtain licensure outside of Utah.**

**Ms. Taxin requested Thorana Nelson to send her the language on the changes for R156-60b-302d(1) and she will make the change. Ms. Taxin stated that the other change is to include information in the application.**

Thorana Nelson asked about part (b).

**Ms. Taxin responded that she has not received any requested changes yet and suggested further discussion be deferred to the next Board meeting.**

**Dr. Soderquist requested Board members to review that area and be prepared for further discussion at the next Board meeting. Dr. Soderquist stated that**



**Minnesota required transcripts be reviewed by an accredited institution to prove the education was equivalent.**

Thorana Nelson responded that she is not sure the Universities would have the time to review transcripts for equivalency.

**Ms. Taxin stated that the Division currently has to review transcripts for equivalency and it is a difficult process.**

**Ms. Taxin requested the Board to review section 3b and be prepared to discuss ideas on how to regulate and who will retain a list. She suggested the Board review each application but the applicant would then have to wait until a Board meeting for the application to be reviewed. Ms. Taxin suggested further discussion at the next scheduled Board meeting. She stated that in the meantime she will continue to request course descriptions and syllabi to assist in the course reviews.**

**Ms. Taxin commented that other Mental Health Therapists are educated people with Masters degrees. She asked the Board to consider if they want other Mental Health Therapists approved to be supervisors of MFT Interns and, if they do want other Mental Health Therapists to be approved to supervise, why is there a requirement of additional education that may have already been completed. She stated that if the Board does not want other Mental Health Therapists to supervise the MFT Interns then that section of the Rules should be taken out.**

**Ms. Taxin asked the Board to please notify her ahead of time if there is anything else that needs to be reviewed and discussed.**

Thorana Nelson stated that phone supervision questions come to her regarding those people in rural areas. She stated that she is finding residential treatment centers are embracing MFT programs and are saying family involvement is producing better outcomes. She stated that agencies are hiring licensed MFT's to work with the kids and have the parents on



the phone. She stated that with phone therapy the parent could not see the kids making faces. Thorana Nelson stated that the current rules are that therapy must be with family members present which is vague for the phone situation. She stated that it is not allowed for the interns to count the time toward their required 4000 hours and the agencies cannot hire interns.

**Ms. Taxin responded that the agencies are hiring MFT Interns but she is not certain that the interns are receiving adequate supervision. Ms. Taxin stated that if the supervisor was overseeing the phone therapy it would be a more adequate but the interns are flying out of State to meet with families and there is no supervisor going with the intern.**

Thorana Nelson commented that the MFT Interns have completed graduate school with a graduate internship in which 50% of the supervision is through live observation. Thorana Nelson stated that she would be more comfortable with an in-home visit locally with the supervisor going with the MFT Intern.

**Ms. Taxin asked if internet therapy is acceptable by the Board and the Association.**

Thorana Nelson responded that the Association asked AAMFT and received a report documenting that the internet therapy is a State issue as AAMFT is of the opinion that it is acceptable. Thorana Nelson continued by stating that the client is the whole family for a Marriage and Family Therapist and this includes the adolescent who is physically sitting with the Marriage and Family Therapist.

**Ms. Taxin stated that telephonic therapy would be difficult when discussing a serious issue. She related that Dr. Dastrup met telephonically for her last probationary appointment and there was a lot of silence while the Board and Dr. Dastrup waited for the other to respond. Ms. Taxin stated that neither the Board nor Dr. Dastrup knew what the other was thinking or doing.**

Thorana Nelson suggested the Board consider allowing for a specific number of hours to count



toward the total therapy hours.

**Dr. Soderquist commented that if the therapist uses the cam phone, where both parties are visual, it might be more acceptable.**

Thorana Nelson stated that cell phones that have visual are not confidential and sessions should be kept confidential.

**Ms. Feinauer asked if there is a consent form that is signed for the telephonic sessions.**

Thorana Nelson responded that there is not currently a consent form that is being used.

**Ms. Taxin requested Thorana Nelson to submit something in writing concerning telephonic therapy and the issue will be put on the December 8, 2006 agenda for further discussion.**

**11:40 A.M.**

Robert Baumgardner, Review experience for MFT licensure by endorsement

Ms. Taxin introduced Mr. Baumgardner and the Board.

**Ms. Taxin summarized for the Board that Mr. Baumgardner came to Utah from California and is applying for the MFT license. She stated that the California requirements are for 3000 hours of supervised mental health therapy experience and Utah requires 4000 hours. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Baumgardner is requesting the Board to accept his 3000 hours of supervised mental health therapy experience as meeting the requirements for Utah licensure.**

Ms. Baumgardner stated that California does structure their experience differently than Utah as California puts a different value on the hours. He stated that California has 1200 hour cap on specific experience hours and the hours obtained after that are not counted. He explained that in writing reports there are 250 hours that count, 250 hours count for telephone counseling, 250 hours count for attending seminars, 500 hours count for family therapy and 750 hours count toward face to face therapy. He stated that for every 10 hours of client contact California requires 1



hour with the supervisor and the supervisor is required to work at the same agency as the MFT Intern. Mr. Baumgardner concluded that once the minimum hours are met there are many more hours under supervision that no one tracks as they do not count.

**Ms. Taxin asked if Mr. Baumgardner's supervisor could verify the additional 1000 hours to meet Utah's requirements.**

Mr. Baumgardner responded that once the hours are met no record is kept of any additional hours. He stated that he was still supervised and gaining experience but did not have to submit the documentation to the State of California for licensing.

**Ms. Taxin asked when Mr. Baumgardner was licensed in California.**

Mr. Baumgardner responded that he was licensed in April 2005.

**Ms. Taxin commented that Mr. Baumgardner is short of licensed practice to meet the requirements of endorsement. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Baumgardner could be approved for the MFT Intern license to obtain the 1000 hours of supervised experience that he is missing for Utah licensing.**

Mr. Baumgardner stated that he does not want to do the 3000 hours over that he has already completed and would appreciate the MFT Intern license to complete only the 1000 hours he is lacking.

**Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Baumgardner will have to locate an AAMFT approved supervisor for the 1000 hours. She referred Mr. Baumgardner to the Utah Laws and Rules for the breakdown of the 4000 hours and explained that he should have 1000 hours with 100 hours face to face with the Utah supervisor.**

**Dr. Nielsen made a motion to approve Mr. Baumgardner for the MFT Intern license based on the application submitted, accepting the 3000 supervised hours from California, requiring Mr.**



**Baumgardner to obtain 100 hours face to face supervision and 1000 hours of client hours from a Utah AAMFT approved supervisor. He stated that the verifications in the current application will be accepted only if Mr. Baumgardner completes the 1000 hours and submits his application for Marriage and Family Therapist to the Division by April 15, 2007.**

**Ms. Feinauer seconded the motion.**

**The Board vote was unanimous.**

**Ms. Taxin stated that the MFT Intern license will be issued to Mr. Baumgardner.**

**12:15 P.M.**

**APPLICATION REVIEW:**

Laurel A. Abts, Review Education and Experience for MFT Licensing

**Lunch Break**

Ms. Taxin explained that Ms. Abts education is not from an accredited program according to the website list. She stated that the University did send a letter stating that the program was accredited when Ms. Abts attended and graduated. Ms. Taxin commented that the Division did accept the education.

Ms. Taxin further explained that Ms. Abts supervisor is not on the AAMFT approved supervisor list. She stated that the supervisor has stated that she is a AAMFT supervisor-in-training but has not submitted any documentation. Ms. Taxin stated that she called the supervisor, Dr. Galine, yesterday who stated that she faxed the AAMFT letter to the Division. Ms. Taxin requested the letter be faxed again as the Division did not receive anything.

Ms. Taxin stated that Ms. Abts has supervision from an LCSW and those hours will not count for Utah as the LCSW has not met the requirements to be a supervisor.

Ms. Taxin asked for a Board recommendation regarding accepting the hours obtained under Dr. Galine or not accepting the hours and requiring Ms. Abts to redo her hours.



**Dr. Nielsen stated that he is of the opinion that the applicant has the responsibility to get the information to the Division as Ms. Taxin is training the applicant to let others take her responsibilities.**

Ms. Taxin responded that Ms. Abts has been responsible to the best of her ability by submitting what she thought was a complete application and by making contact with Dr. Galine regarding the AAMFT approved supervisor issue.

Ms. Taxin asked if she should wait for the letter from Dr. Galine and, if nothing is received, issue the MFT Intern license or, if the letter is received and verifies AAMFT supervisor-in-training issue the MFT license to Ms. Abts.

**Dr. Soderquist recommended Ms. Taxin issue the MFT Intern license if nothing is received.**

**The Board recommended the MFT license be issued if the letter is received and verifies Dr. Galine is an AAMFT supervisor-in-training.**

Jeffrey DelBosque, Review Education for  
MFT Intern Licensing

Ms. Taxin explained that Mr. DelBosque has submitted an application for MFT Intern licensing. She stated that he is currently an AAMFT approved supervisor but has never obtained a MFT license. She stated he is licensed as an MFT Intern in California. Ms. Taxin stated that she and the licensing specialists have reviewed Mr. DelBosque's transcripts and are of the opinion that he is lacking some of the courses required for MFT Intern licensure in Utah.

**Dr. Soderquist reviewed Mr. DelBosque's transcripts and determined he is lacking courses required for Utah MFT Intern licensure.**

**Based on Mr. DelBosque lacking more than 4 courses, the Board recommended Mr. DelBosque be contacted regarding changing the type of application from the MFT Intern to the MFT Extern to allow him to obtain the deficient courses.**

Jeremy Yorgenson, Review for MFT Intern  
Licensing

Ms. Taxin explained that Mr. Yorgenson is not licensed in Utah and is an AAMFT approved supervisor. She stated that Mr. Yorgenson has been



supervising MFT Interns. Ms. Taxin stated that Mr. Yorgenson does have an MFT degree from an accredited program and meets the Utah requirement to be licensed as an MFT Intern. Ms. Taxin stated that the issue of an AAMFT approved supervisor will be discussed later in the meeting.

**Based on Mr. Yorgenson meeting the requirements for MFT Intern, the Board recommended the license be issued.**

Roy A. Bean, MFT Licensure

Ms. Taxin explained that Dr. Bean is a professor at BYU and has on his telephone message that he is a professor and in private practice. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Bean is not licensed in Utah and she informed him that he has to change the telephone message to take off the private practice.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Bean does have a PhD and does not need a license to work as a professor.

Ms. Taxin explained that Dr. Bean was licensed in Texas in 2004 and does not meet the endorsement requirements for licensure in Utah. She stated that Dr. Bean would have to submit a complete application for MFT with documentation of the required 4000 supervised hours. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Bean submitted a letter regarding his supervised hours and that he could not obtain a verification of his hours. She read Dr. Bean's letter regarding the supervised hours being obtained under supervision of a mental health therapist who is not MFT licensed. Dr. Bean requested the Board to accept his hours and recommend MFT licensing. She stated that the Utah Law requires a specific type of supervision and Dr. Bean would have to be licensed as an MFT Intern to obtain the hours under supervision of an appropriate supervisor.

Ms. Taxin stated that she gets requests from California applicants and from BYU students for exceptions to the Law and Rules.

**Dr. Soderquist commented that the Board cannot recommend MFT licensure when Dr. Bean has not documented properly that he has met requirements.**



**Based on the application information and Dr. Bean's letter, the Board recommended the MFT Intern license be issued and Dr. Bean be required to obtain the full 4000 hours under appropriate supervision as required by Utah Law and Rule.**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

Board Chairperson

**Ms. Feinauer requested this item be deferred to the December 8, 2006 meeting in order to have all Board members involved.**

Update on David Gardner, Probationer

Ms. Taxin reported that Dr. Gardner has not yet renewed his license nor submitted the required CE information for the CE audit. She stated that he had called and notified the Division that he had not yet completed the CE requirement but would have it completed and submitted before September 30, 2006. Ms. Taxin reported that the drug testing is not an issue for Dr. Gardner as it has been consistently negative. She stated that Dr. Gardner has not yet found employment in the MFT arena. Ms. Taxin voiced concerns regarding Dr. Gardner's competency to practice as it has been many years. Ms. Taxin read several letters from Dr. Gardner to the Board.

**Dr. Soderquist voiced concern that Dr. Gardner responded in one letter regarding her being offended. She stated that these meetings are professional meetings and is of the opinion that Dr. Gardner sees the meetings as informal chummy meetings.**

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Gardner had a violation, signed his Stipulation and Order and has been unable to meet the requirements.

Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Gardner was on the CE audit list and must submit documentation of completing the CE requirement or his renewal will be denied. She stated that failure to meet the renewal requirements is a violation of his Stipulation and Order. Ms. Taxin stated that Dr. Gardner notified her that he would have all requirements submitted by the renewal deadline of September 30, 2006.



**Ms. Feinauer commented that the Board has reached a cross-road as Dr. Gardner has not completed his CE and is not currently working in the field. She suggested he be given until December 8, 2006 to come into compliance with his Stipulation and Order and invite him to meet with the Board for a decision to be made.**

Ms. Taxin asked the Board if they would want an extension on the CE and on his being employed by December 8, 2006.

**The Board responded that an extension should not be given.**

**Dr. Soderquist stated that Dr. Gardner has not initiated anything and the Division and Board should not continue to give him more changes.**

Ms. Taxin responded that she will call Dr. Gardner and inform him of the following:

1. He must have the CE completed and submitted by September 30, 2006.
2. He must have a position and supervisor in place by December 8, 2006.
3. He will be invited to meet with the Board for the December 8, 2006 meeting to discuss his situation.

**The Board concurred.**

Discuss Supervision and Other Elements of the Rules (Jeremy Jorgenson)

Ms. Taxin asked the Board how Mr. Yorgenson and others are qualified to supervise if they do not hold valid MFT licenses.

**Dr. Soderquist responded that if they are an AAMFT approved supervisor then they meet the requirements of the Utah Rules to be an approved supervisor.**

Ms. Taxin stated that she is being asked for exceptions and when she starts making exceptions then applicants want more exceptions. She stated that the requests are coming from BYU and she is not getting requests for exceptions from other Universities.

**Ms. Feinauer suggested AAMFT and/or Utah**



**AMFT be asked to tighten up their requirements for supervisors.**

Ms. McCall commented that Mr. Yorgenson and others would not be approved supervisors for Utah MFT Interns as the MFT Law, 58-60-307(1)(a), requires 2 years of clinical practice from the date of first MFT licensure before being a supervisor. She stated that Mr. Yorgenson will be an MFT Intern and then would have to be licensed at least 2 years as an MFT before he would qualify to be a supervisor.

Ms. Taxin stated that the Board also needs to discuss evaluating the coursework to be a Utah approved supervisor. She stated that there are 3 ways to become a supervisor:

1. Be currently approved by AAMFT as a marriage and family therapist supervisor.
2. Be currently licensed in good standing as a marriage and family therapist in the state in which the supervised training is being performed; and meet the following requirements: (a) have lawfully engaged in the practice of mental health therapy for not less than two years; and (b) complete specific coursework.
3. Be currently licensed as a clinical social worker, psychologist or professional counselor in Utah and meet the following requirements: (a) have lawfully engaged in the practice of mental health therapy for not less than two years, (b) complete specific coursework and (c)(i) complete a supervision course in a COAMFTE accredited MFT program or (c)(ii) complete 20 clock hours of instruction sponsored by AAMFT or UAMFT.

Ms. Taxin stated that, as previously discussed during the Rules review, the Licensed Clinical Social Workers and Professional Counselors may have had the required courses in their education and, if they have, they would still be required to retake those specific courses.

Ms. Taxin again stated that she is seeing crossing over



of courses that are taken for all three professions. She stated that if they are all taking the same courses the Board should consider accepting the education.

Ms. Taxin stated that it would be easier if a list of specific courses was developed for the Licensing Specialists to refer to when reviewing applications for approving supervisors. Ms. Taxin requested the Board to review the Law and Rules section for an approved supervisor for further discussion at the December 8, 2006 Board meeting.

Discuss an Official Supervisor List

Discussed during rules review.

Annual Board Member Training

Deferred to December 8, 2006

**NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR:**

December 8, 2006

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT:**

2:33 P.M.

---

Date Approved

---

Chairperson, Utah Marriage and Family Therapy  
Licensing Board

---

Date Approved

---

Bureau Manager, Division of Occupational &  
Professional Licensing